

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Support is found in Figure 1 and described on page 8, lines 1-7, and throughout the Examples.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 13, 19 and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kanai et al. (US 6,121,727). This rejection is respectfully traversed. As quoted from Col. 2, lines 30-41 of Kanai:

“Thus, the present invention provides an organic electroluminescent device having an organic luminescent layer interposed between an anode and a cathode, on a substrate, wherein a cathode interface layer comprising a specific metal compound, is formed between the cathode and the organic luminescent layer of the device. Specifically, it provides an organic luminescent device, wherein a cathode interface layer comprising at least one compound selected from a halide of a metal of Group 2A of the Periodic Table, a halide of a metal of Group 3A of the Periodic Table and a complex halide compound of at least two metal elements, is formed.”

Therefore, Kanai discloses a cathode interface layer comprising at least one compound selected from a halide of a metal. The cathode interface layer is necessary for improving the adhesion and preventing diffusion between the cathode and the fluorescent layer (Col. 7, line 66-Col. 8, line 2).

Applicants' invention, as found in presently amended claim 1, describes a cathode comprising at least one first cathode layer selected from metal, metal oxide and combinations thereof. Applicants' first cathode layer is not a “cathode interface layer” comprising a halide of a metal. In addition, the emissive layer is in contact with the first cathode layer. No “cathode interface layer” is present between the emissive layer and the first cathode layer.


Therefore, the disclosure in Kanai does not identically describe Applicants' claimed invention on an element-by-element basis nor is the disclosure capable of enabling one of ordinary art to practice Applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4, 6-10, 12,14-18, 20-23 under 35 USC 103(a) over Kanai et al. in view of Helmut F. Wolf (Semiconductor, copyright 1971, p. 424). Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider in light of the current arguments presented above. As Applicants stated above, the comparison between the presently claimed invention and the disclosure in Kanai provides significant differences. Kanai does not in any manner teach or suggest an emissive layer in contact with the first cathode layer wherein the first cathode layer is selected from metal, metal oxide and combinations thereof. Therefore,

the combination of Kanai with Wolf does not in any manner lead to or suggest Applicants' claimed device.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
**LOIS A. SANTOPIETRO**  
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS  
Registration No.: 36,264  
Telephone: (302) 892-7752  
Facsimile: (302) 892-7949

Dated: October 20, 2003